REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1 - 4 and 6 - 14 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 1 and 9 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 1 - 4, and 6 - 14

In Section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 - 4, and 6 - 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn (U.S. Patent No 5,945,987; hereinafter referred to as "Dunn") in view of Wheeler (U.S. Pre Grant Publication No. 2001/0056478; hereinafter referred to as "Wheeler"). Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to address the rejection.

In the Background section of the Specification, it was disclosed that "[i]n the case of digital satellite broadcasting, the number of channels is very large, and a single channel provides many programs . . . . A viewer is thus required to have special skills in order to appropriately select a desired broadcast program from among such a huge number of broadcast programs, and it is often difficult for the viewer to retrieve a desired broadcast program." *Background of the Specification, page 1, lines 15-22.* "In order to select the appropriate program, the EPG data is searched for the appropriate program using a keyword. In general, retrieval using a keyword, and particularly ambiguous retrieval, demands a large database and fast processing. In consideration of the expense, it is substantially impossible for an individual to perform such retrieval." *Background of the Specification, page 2, lines 13-19.*

"Therefore, the viewer is connected to a broadcast program retriever via communication lines such as telephone lines. The viewer gives a keyword for retrieving a desired broadcast

program to the broadcast program retriever. The broadcast program retriever searches for the desired program and provides the viewer with information on the retrieval results. When the viewer receives the entirety of the information on the retrieval results via the telephone lines and the like, detailed information on the broadcast program is generally transmitted, thus requiring a long communication period, which is expensive." *Background of the Specification, page 2, line 20 to page 3, line 6.*

To solve this problem, embodiments of the present invention provide broadcast program retrieval system and method for retrieving a desired broadcast program more efficiently among a plurality of broadcast programs. For example, the structure of system claim 1, as presented herein, includes:

> *a data server* including a database configured to receive and store broadcast program information and a plurality of broadcast programs, and at least one function for searching the broadcast program information, which includes at least one program retrieval identification code and other information related to broadcast programs; and
>
> *a user server* configured to receive and store the broadcast program information and a plurality of broadcast programs, said user server operating to send to the data server at least one content keyword for searching the broadcast program information for the desired broadcast program, said user server operating to receive from the data server only a select number of program retrieval identification codes related to said at least one content keyword as a result of the searching by the data server,
>
> wherein said plurality of broadcast programs stored on said data server is identical to the plurality of broadcast programs stored on said user server; and
>
> wherein the select number of program retrieval identification codes received from the data server enables said user server to retrieve a select number of broadcast program information stored in the user server, and allows a user to review the select number of broadcast program information and to select the desired broadcast program from among a select number of broadcast programs stored on the user server corresponding to the reviewed select number of broadcast program information.

(emphasis added)

Accordingly, in one aspect the structure of system claim 1 includes a data server that stores broadcast program information and a plurality of broadcast programs; and a user server that stores broadcast program information and a plurality of broadcast programs, operating to receive from the data server only a select number of program retrieval identification codes related to the content keyword as a result of the searching by the data server. The select number of program retrieval identification codes allows a user to review the select number of broadcast program information and to select the desired broadcast program from among a select number of broadcast programs stored on the user server corresponding to the reviewed select number of broadcast program information. Further, the plurality of broadcast programs stored on the data server is identical to the plurality of programs stored on the user server. *See Specification, page 7, line 24 to page 8, line 6.* Thus, the select number of program retrieval identification codes not only allows the user to retrieve a select number of broadcast program information in the user server, but these codes further allow the user to review the select number of broadcast program information, a smaller subset of information, and to select a desired broadcast program from among a select number of broadcast programs stored on the user server corresponding to the retrieved select number of broadcast program information.

As amended, claim 1 recites a broadcast retrieval system wherein said plurality of broadcast programs stored on said data server is identical to the plurality of broadcast programs stored on said user server. By contrast, Wheeler discloses two devices that store different information: "[s]torage device 14 contains information about the same general subject matter as the material located at the website on server 30 [sic]. For example, memory device 14 may contain pictures of travel locations, attractions, and hotels, while the website contains

information on current airfares, prices, availability or events. Thus, by the combination of information from both the storage device 14 and the website on server 10, the user is able to obtain current information about various travel locations, without having to wait for all of the information to be transmitted over the public telephone lines 22." *Wheeler, [0026].* Therefore, Wheeler discloses two different storage locations for data: a server 10 and storage device 14, each containing different information that is apparently unrelated to broadcast program information. Server 10 contains information indicating the contents of storage device 14, so that when a user requests certain information from server 10 that is on storage device 14, "the server can direct the user's browser to retrieve the requested data from storage device 14," resulting in retrieval of the requested data from two different sources. *Wheeler, [0028].* Therefore, Wheeler merely discloses two devices that store different elements of information requested by a user. Accordingly, Wheeler fails to teach or suggest storing a plurality of broadcast information on the user server that is identical to the plurality of broadcast information stored by the data server, as claimed.

Further, it was indicated that Dunn does not disclose receiving from the data server only a select number of program retrieval codes related to a query result; wherein the select number of program retrieval codes received from the data server enables the user to retrieve the broadcast program information. *Office Action, page 4.* It was indicated that paragraphs [0012] and [0028] of Wheeler discloses these limitations. *Office Action, pages 4-5.* Yet section [0028] of Wheeler, as cited above, merely discloses receiving requested information from a second device based on a redirection of a browser by the first storage device to a second storage device. Paragraph [0012] merely discloses a user contacting a website and the website transmitting a signal containing a web address of a local storage device. Therefore, Wheeler fails to disclose or teach

receiving from the data server only a select number of program retrieval codes related to a query result, wherein the select number of program retrieval codes received from the data server enables the user to retrieve the broadcast program information.

Therefore, Dunn and Wheeler, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a broadcast retrieval system wherein said plurality of broadcast programs stored in said data server is identical to the plurality of broadcast programs stored in said user server, and wherein the select number of program retrieval identification codes received from the data server enables said user server to retrieve a select number of broadcast program information stored in the user server, and allows a user to review the select number of broadcast program information and to select the desired broadcast program from among a select number of broadcast programs stored on the user server corresponding to the reviewed select number of broadcast program information, as claimed (emphasis added).

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is maintained Dunn and Wheeler, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable over Dunn and Wheeler. Further, since independent claim 9, as amended herein, closely parallels, and includes substantially similar limitations as, claim 1, claim 9 should also be allowable over Dunn and Wheeler. Since claims 2 - 4 and 6 - 8 depend from claim 1, and claims 10-14 depend from claim 9, claims 2 - 4, 6 - 8, and 10 - 14 should also be allowable over Dunn and Wheeler.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1 - 4 and 6 - 14 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1 - 4 and 6 - 14 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: Samuel S. Lee, Reg. No. 42,791 for
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800